Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

Inexact projected gradient methods for vector optimization problems on variable ordered spaces

Jose Yunier Bello Cruz · Gemayqzel Bouza Allende

arXiv:1701.01710v1 [math.OC] 6 Jan 2017

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract Variable order setting models situations in which the comparison between two points depends on a point-to-cone application. In this paper an inexact projected method for solving smooth constrained vector optimization problems on variable ordered spaces is presented. It is shown that every accumulation point of the generated sequence satisfies a first order necessary optimality condition. The behavior of this approach is also studied under K–convexity of the objective function where the convergence is established to a weakly efficient point. Moreover, the convergence results is derived in the particular case in which the problem is unconstrained and if exact directions are taken as descend directions. Furthermore, we adapt the proposed method to optimization models in which the domain of the variable order application and the objective function is the same. In this case, similar concepts and convergence results are presented. Finally, some computational experiments designed to investigate and illustrate the behavior of the proposed methods are presented.

Keywords Gradient method · K–convexity · Variable order · Vector optimization · Weakly efficient points

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) 90C29 · 90C52 · 65K05

Jose Yunier Bello Cruz, Corresponding author
Department of Mathematical Sciences, Northern Illinois University. Watson Hall 366, DeKalb, IL, USA - 60115.
yunierbello@niu.edu

Gemayqzel Bouza Allende
Facultad de Matemática y Computación, Universidad de La Habana, La Habana, Cuba - 10400.
gema@matcom.uh.cu

1 Introduction

Variable order is a natural extension of the well-known fixed (partial) order given by a closed, pointed and convex cone. This kind of orderings model situations in which the comparison between two points depends on a set valued application. Research focused in vector optimization problems on variable ordered spaces and its applications has recently received much attention from the optimization community due to its broad applications to several different areas. Variable order structures given by a point-to-cone valued application, were well studied in [1], motivated by important applications which appear in medical diagnosis, portfolio optimization, capability theory of wellbeing, psychological modeling, and location theory; see, for instance, [2–7]. The main goal of these models is to find an element of a certain set such that the evaluation of the objective function cannot be improved by the image of any other feasible point with respect to the variable order. So, their mathematical description corresponds to the called Optimization Problem on Variable Ordered Spaces (OPVOS). For above reasons, it is important obtain efficient and implementable solution algorithms for solving this kind of models.

OPVOSs have been treated in [8], in the sense of finding a minimizer of the image of a vector function, with respect to an ordered structure depending on points in the image. It is a particular case of the problem described in [9], where the goal of the model is to find a minimum of a set. Here we will consider a partial (variable) order defined by the cone-valued application which is used to define our problem - OPVOS. We want to point out that OPVOS generalizes the classical vector optimization model. Indeed, it corresponds to the case in which the order is defined by a constant cone valued application. Many approaches have been proposed to solve classical vector optimization, such as gradient methods, proximal points iterations, weighting techniques schemes, Newton-like and subgradient methods; see, for instance, [10–21]. The use of extensions of these iterative algorithms to the variable ordering setting is currently a promising idea. It is worth noting that, as far as we know, only few of these schemes mentioned above have been proposed and studied in the variable ordering setting; as e.g., the steepest descent algorithm and sub-gradient-like algorithms for unconstrained problems; see, for instance, [22, 23]. In this work, due to its simplicity and the adaptability to the structure of the vectorial problem, we present an inexact projected gradient method for solving constrained variable order vector problems. The properties of the accumulation points of the generated sequence are studied and its convergence is also analyzed under convexity. Moreover, we derive the exact projected gradient method and the inexact unconstrained case. Finally, analogous results are obtained if the variable order is given by a point-to-cone application whose domain coincides with the image of the objective function.

This work is organized as follows. The next section provides some notations and preliminary results that will be used in the remainder of this paper. We also recall the concept of K–convexity of a function on a variable ordered space and present some properties of this

class. Section 3 is devoted to the presentation of the algorithm. The convergence of the sequence generated by the projected gradient method is shown in Section 4. Then, under the K–convexity of the objective function and the convexity of the set of feasible solutions, we guarantee that the generated sequence is bounded and all its accumulation points are solutions of the variable order problem. Section 5 discusses about the properties of this algorithm when the variable order is taken as a cone value set from the image of objective function. Section 6 introduces some examples illustrating the behavior of both proposed methods. Finally, some final remarks are given.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we present some previous results and definitions. First we will define the constrained vector optimization problems on variable ordered spaces which finds a K–minimizer of F in the set C:

$$K - \min F(x), \quad x \in C. \tag{1}$$

Here C is a convex closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $K : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$ is a point-to-cone map, where $K(x)$ is a nonempty pointed, convex and closed cone, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We say that the point x^* is a minimizer of (1) if for all $x \in C$,

$$F(x) - F(x^*) \notin K(x^*) \setminus \{0\}.$$

The set of all minimizers of problem (1) is denoted by S^*.

Next we introduce some useful notations: Throughout this paper, we write $p := q$ to indicate that p is defined to be equal to q and we write $\mathbb{N}$ for the nonnegative integers $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$. The inner product in $\mathbb{R}^n$ will be denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and the induced norm by $\| \cdot \|$. The closed ball centered at x with radius r is represented by $\mathbb{B}(x, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|y - x\| \leq r\}$ and also the sphere by $\mathbb{S}(x, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{B}(x, r) : \|y - x\| = r\}$. Given two bounded sets A and B, we will consider $\mathrm{d}_H(A, B)$ as the *Hausdorff* distance, *i.e.*

$$\mathrm{d}_H(A, B) := \max \left\{ \sup_{a \in A} \inf_{b \in B} d(a, b), \sup_{b \in B} \inf_{a \in A} d(a, b) \right\},$$

or equivalently $\mathrm{d}_H(A, B) = \inf\{\epsilon \geq 0 : A \subseteq B_\epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad B \subseteq A_\epsilon\}$, where $D_\epsilon := \cup_{d \in D}\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathrm{dist}(d, x) \leq \epsilon\}$ is the ϵ–enlargement of any set D. The set D^c denotes the complement of D. Given the partial order structure induced by a cone $\mathcal{K}$, the concept of infimum of a sequence can be defined. Indeed, for a sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a cone $\mathcal{K}$, the point x^* is $\inf_k\{x^k\}$ iff $(x^k - x^*)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{K}$, and there is not x such that $x^* - x \in \mathcal{K}$ and $(x^k - x)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{K}$. We said that $\mathcal{K}$ has the *Daniell* property if for all sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $(x^k - x^{k+1})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{K}$ and for some $\hat{x}$, $(x^k - \hat{x})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{K}$, then $\lim_{k \to \infty} x^k = \inf_k\{x^k\}$. Here we assume that $K(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, is a convex, pointed, and closed cone, which guarantees that

$K(x)$ has the Daniell property as was shown in [24]. For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the dual cone of $K(x)$ is defined as $K^*(x) := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^m : \langle w, y\rangle \geq 0, \text{ for all } y \in K(x)\}$. As usual, the graph of a set valued application K is the set $Gr(K) := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m : \ y \in K(x)\}$. We recall that the mapping K is closed if $Gr(K)$ is a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$.

As in the case of classical vector optimization, related solution concepts such as weakly efficient and stationary points can be extended. The point x^* is a weak solution of problem (1) if for all $x \in C$, $F(x) - F(x^*) \notin -int(K(x^*))$, S^w is the set of all weak solution points. We want to point out that this definition corresponds with the concept of weak minimizer given in [9]. On the other hand, if F is a continuously differentiable function, the point x^* is stationary, iff for all $d \in C - x^* := \{d \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ d = c - x^*, \text{ for some } c \in C\}$, we have

$$\nabla F(x^*)d \notin -int(K(x^*)).$$

S^s denotes the set of all stationary points.

Next we present a constrained version of Proposition 2.1 of [22] as follows:

Proposition 2.1 *Let x^* be a weak solution of problem (1). If F is a continuously differentiable function, then x^* is a stationary point.*

Proof Suppose that x^* is a weak solution of problem (1). Fix $d \in C - x^*$. By definition there exists $c \in C$, such that $d = c - x^*$. Since C is a convex set, for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, $x^* + \alpha d \in C$. As x^* is a weak solution of P, $F(x^* + \alpha d) - F(x^*) \notin -int(K(x^*))$. Hence,

$$F(x^* + \alpha d) - F(x^*) \in (-int(K(x^*)))^c. \tag{2}$$

The Taylor expansion of F at x^*, leads us to $F(x^* + \alpha d) = F(x^*) + \alpha \nabla F(x^*)d + o(\alpha)$. The above equation together with (2) implies $\alpha \nabla F(x^*)d + o(\alpha) \in (-int(K(x^*)))^c$. Using that $(-int(K(x^*)))^c$ is a closed cone, and since $\alpha > 0$, it follows that

$$\nabla F(x^*)d + \frac{o(\alpha)}{\alpha} \in (-int(K(x^*)))^c.$$

Taking limit in the above inclusion, when α goes to 0, and using the closedness of $(-int(K(x^*)))^c$, we obtain that $\nabla F(x^*)d \in (-int(K(x^*)))^c$, establishing that $x^* \in S^s$. □

In classical optimization, stationarity is also a sufficient for weak minimality under convexity. For vector optimization problems on variable ordered spaces, the convexity concept was introduced in Definition 3.1 of [22] as follows:

Definition 2.1 We say that F is a K–convex function in C if for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $x, \bar{x} \in C$,

$$F(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)\bar{x}) \in \lambda F(x) + (1 - \lambda)F(\bar{x}) - K(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)\bar{x}).$$

It is important to note that the convexity of epi(F) is equivalent to the K–convexity of F iff $K(x) \equiv K$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$; see Proposition 3.1 of [22]. As already shown in [22], K–convex functions have directional derivatives under natural assumptions; see Proposition 3.5 of [22]. In particular, if $Gr(K)$ is closed and $F \in \mathcal{C}^1$ is K–convex, then we have the gradient inclusion inequality as follows:

$$F(x) - F(\bar{x}) \in \nabla F(\bar{x})(x - \bar{x}) + K(\bar{x}), \quad x \in C,\ \bar{x} \in C. \tag{3}$$

In the next proposition we study the relation between stationarity, descent directions and weak solution concept in the constrained sense for problem (1).

Proposition 2.2 *Let K be a point-to-cone and closed mapping, and F be a K–convex function. Then,*

(i) *The point x^* is a weak solution of problem* (1) *iff it is a stationary point.*

(ii) *If for all $d \in C - x^*$, $\nabla F(x^*)d \notin -K(x^*) \setminus \{0\}$, then x^* is a minimizer.*

Proof **(i):** Let $x^* \in S^s$, where S^s is the set of the stationary points. If x^* is not a weak minimizer then there exists $x \in C$ such that $F(x) - F(x^*) = -k_1 \in -int(K(x^*))$. By the convexity of F, for some $k_2 \in K(x^*)$, we have

$$-k_1 = F(x) - F(x^*) = \nabla F(x^*)(x - x^*) + k_2. \tag{4}$$

It follows from (4) that

$$\nabla F(x^*)(x - x^*) = -(k_1 + k_2). \tag{5}$$

Moreover, since $K(x^*)$ is a convex cone, $k_1 \in int(K(x^*))$ and $k_2 \in K(x^*)$, it holds that $k_1 + k_2 \in int(K(x^*))$. Thus, (4) and (5) imply that $\nabla F(x^*)(x - x^*) \in -int(K(x^*))$, which contradicts the fact that x^* is a stationary point because x belongs to C and hence $x - x^* \in C - x^*$. The conversely implication was already shown in Proposition 2.1.

(ii): By contradiction suppose that there exists $x \in C$ such that $F(x) - F(x^*) = -k_1$, where $k_1 \in K(x^*) \setminus \{0\}$. Combining the previous condition with (5), it follows that

$$\nabla F(x^*)(x - x^*) = -(k_1 + k_2) \in -K(x^*).$$

Using that $\nabla F(x^*)(x-x^*) \notin -K(x^*)\setminus\{0\}$, we get that $(k_1+k_2) = 0$, and as $k_1, k_2 \in K(x^*)$, $k_1 = -k_2$. It follows from the pointedness of the cone $K(x^*)$ that $k_1 = k_2 = 0$, contradicting the fact that $k_1 \neq 0$. □

It is worth mentioning that the concept of K–convexity for F depends of the point-to-cone mapping K. Thus, this general approach covers several convexity concepts, from the scalar setting to the vector one and it can be used to model a large number of applications;

see, for instance, [5–7]. In Section 5 we discuss another variable order when the point-to-cone application depends of the image set of F, such kind of variable orders was introduced and studied in [22, 23].

After we had been presenting the theory of convexity for constrained vector optimization problems on variable ordered spaces, a solution approach to solve problem (1) will be studied in the next section.

3 The Inexact Projected Gradient Method

This section is devoted to present an inexact projected gradient method for solving constrained smooth problems equipped with variable order. This method uses an Armijo-type line-search, which is done on descent feasible directions. The proposed scheme here has two main differences with respect to the approach introduced in [22]. First constrained problems as (1) are considered. Second the introduced method, instead of computing the direction through the exact solution of subproblem (P_x) given below, it accepts approximate solutions of this subproblem with some tolerance. Thus, in the following, several constrained concepts and results will be presented and proved, which will be used in the convergence analysis of the proposed method below.

We start the section by presenting some definitions and basic properties of some auxiliary functions and sets, which will be useful in the convergence analysis of the proposed algorithms. Firstly we define the set valued mapping $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$, which for each x, defines the set of the normalized generators of $K^*(x)$, *i.e.* $G(x) \subseteq K^*(x) \cap \mathbb{S}(0,1)$ is a compact set such that the cone generated by its convex hull is $K^*(x)$. Although the set of the dual cone $K^*(x) \cap \mathbb{S}(0,1)$ fulfils those properties, in general it is possible to take smaller sets; see, for instance, [25–27].

On the other hand, we consider function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\phi(x, v) := \max_{y \in G(x)} y^T \nabla F(x) v, \tag{6}$$

and for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\beta > 0$, the auxiliary subproblem

$$\min_{v \in C - x} \left\{ \frac{\|v\|^2}{2} + \beta \phi(x, v) \right\}. \tag{P_x}$$

Next proposition provides a characterization of the stationarity using the auxiliary function ϕ, defined in (6). The unconstrained version of the following proposition can be found in Proposition 4.1 of [22].

Proposition 3.1 *The following statements hold:*

(i) *For each* $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\max_{y \in G(x)} y^T \hat{w} < 0$ *if and only if* $\hat{w} \in -int(K(x))$.

(ii) *The point* x *is not stationary iff there exists* $v \in C - x$ *such that* $\phi(x, v) < 0$.

(iii) *If* $\phi(x, v) < 0$, *then there exists* $\overline{\lambda} > 0$ *such that* $\dfrac{\|\lambda v\|^2}{2} + \beta\phi(x, \lambda v) < 0$ *for all* $\lambda \in (0, \overline{\lambda}]$.

(iv) *For each* $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, *subproblem* (P_x) *has a unique solution, denoted by* $v(x)$.

Proof **(i):** Defining

$$\rho(x, w) := \max_{y \in G(x)} y^T w \tag{7}$$

the result of this item follows as in Proposition 4.1(i) of [22].

(ii): Note that fixed x, it follows from (6) that $\phi(x, v) = \rho(x, \nabla F(x)v)$. Then, by the definition of stationarity and item (i), the statement holds true.

(iii): It follows from the definition of $\phi(x, v)$ that $\phi(x, \cdot)$ is a positive homogeneous function. Thus, for all $\lambda > 0$,

$$\frac{\|\lambda v\|^2}{2} + \beta\phi(x, \lambda v) = \lambda \left(\lambda \frac{\|v\|^2}{2} + \beta\phi(x, v) \right). \tag{8}$$

Since $\phi(x, v) < 0$, there exists $\bar{\lambda} > 0$ small enough such that $\bar{\lambda}\dfrac{\|v\|^2}{2} + \beta\phi(x, v) < 0$. Hence, (8) together with the above inequality implies that $\dfrac{\|\lambda v\|^2}{2} + \beta\phi(x, \lambda v) < 0$, for all $\lambda \in (0, \bar{\lambda}]$, as desired.

(iv): Using the definition of $\phi(x, v)$, given in (8), it is easy to prove that ϕ is a sublinear function as well. So, $\phi(x, \cdot)$ is a convex function, and then, $\dfrac{\|v\|^2}{2} + \beta\phi(x, v)$ is a strongly convex function. Since C is a convex set, $C - x$ is also convex and hence, subproblem (P_x) has a unique minimizer. □

Remark 3.1 As a consequence of (6), if ∇F is locally Lipschitz, then $\phi(x, \cdot)$ is also locally Lipschitz and hence continuous. Indeed, Proposition 4.1(iv) of [22] implies that $\rho(x, w)$, defined in (7), is a Lipschitz function for all $(x, w) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times W$ for any bounded subset $W \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. That is,

$$|\rho(x_1, w_1) - \rho(x_2, w_2)| \leq L_G M \|x_1 - x_2\| + \|w_1 - w_2\|, \tag{9}$$

where L_G is defined in Proposition 3.2(iv) below and $\|w\| \leq M$ for all $w \in W$. Thus, It follows from the same analysis done below until (13) that $|\phi(x_1, z) - \phi(x_2, z)| \leq (L_G M + L_F \hat{M})\|x_1 - x_2\|$, where L_F is the Lipschitz constant of ∇F and $\|z\| \leq \hat{M}$. □

Based on Proposition 3.1(iii), we define $v(x)$ as the unique solution of problem (P_x) and $y(x,v)$ is an element of $G(x)$ such that $y(x,v)^T\nabla F(x)v = \phi(x,v)$. We will discuss about the continuity of

$$\theta_\beta(x) := \frac{\|v(x)\|^2}{2} + \beta\phi(x, v(x)). \tag{10}$$

The following proposition is the constrained version of Proposition 4.2 in [22].

Proposition 3.2 *Consider $x, \hat{x} \in C$ and fix $\beta > 0$, then the following hold*

(i) *$\theta_\beta(x) \leq 0$ and x is a stationary point iff $\theta_\beta(x) = 0$.*

(ii) *$\|v(x)\| \leq 2\beta\|\nabla F(x)\|$.*

(iii) *If G is a closed application, then θ_β is an upper semi-continuous function.*

(iv) *If $d_H(G(x), G(\hat{x})) \leq L_G\|x - \hat{x}\|$ for some $L_G > 0$ and ∇F is locally Lipschitz, then θ_β is a lower semicontinuos function.*

Proof **(i):** For the first part, note that as $0 \in C - x$ for all $x \in C$, $\theta_\beta(x) \leq \frac{\|0\|^2}{2} + \beta\phi(x,0) = 0$. As shown in Proposition 3.1(ii), x is a non stationary point iff for some $v \in C - x$, $\phi(x,v) < 0$. Then, by Proposition 3.1(iii), there exists $\hat{v} \in C - x$ such that $\frac{\lambda^2}{2}\|v\|^2 + \lambda\beta\phi(x,v) < 0$ and hence $\theta_\beta(x) < 0$.

(ii): By (i), $0 \geq \theta_\beta(x) = \frac{\|v(x)\|^2}{2} + \beta y(x, v(x))^T\nabla F(x)v(x)$. Then, after some algebra, we get

$$\frac{\|v(x)\|^2}{2} \leq -\beta y(x, v(x))^T\nabla F(x)v(x) \leq \beta\|y(x, v(x))^T\nabla F(x)v(x)\|.$$

Using that $\|y(x, v(x))\| = 1$, it follows from the above inequality that

$$\frac{\|v(x)\|^2}{2} \leq \beta\|\nabla F(x)\|\|v(x)\|,$$

and the result follows after dividing by the positive term $\|v(x)\| \neq 0$.

(iii): Now we prove the upper semi-continuity of the function θ_β. Let $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence converging to x. Take $\hat{x}$ such that $v(x) = \hat{x} - x$. It is clear that as, for all k, $\hat{x} - x^k \in C - x^k$,

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_\beta(x^k) &\leq \frac{\|\hat{x} - x^k\|^2}{2} + \beta\phi(x^k, \hat{x} - x^k) \\ &= \frac{\|\hat{x} - x^k\|^2}{2} + \beta y_k^T\nabla F(x^k)(\hat{x} - x^k).\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Since each y_k belongs to the compact set $G(x^k) \subseteq K^*(x^k) \cap \mathbb{S}(0,1) \subseteq \mathbb{B}(0,1)$ for all k, then the sequence $(y_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded because is in $\cup_{k\in\mathbb{N}}G(x^k) \subseteq \mathbb{B}(0,1)$. Therefore, there

exists a convergent subsequence of $(y_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$. We can assume without lost of generality that $\lim_{k\to\infty} y_k = y$, and also since G is closed, $y \in G(x)$. Taking limit in (11), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{k\to\infty} \theta_\beta(x^k) &\leq \limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{\|\hat{x}-x^k\|^2}{2} + \beta y_k^T \nabla F(x^k)(\hat{x}-x^k)\\ &= \frac{\|\hat{x}-x\|^2}{2} + \beta y^T \nabla F(x)(\hat{x}-x)\\ &\leq \frac{\|\hat{x}-x\|^2}{2} + \beta\phi(x,\hat{x}-x) = \theta_\beta(x).\end{aligned}$$

Then, the function θ_β, defined in (10), is upper semi-continuous.

(iv): We proceed as in item (ii) above. First we prove that $\phi(x,\hat{x}^k-x)-\phi(x^k,\hat{x}^k-x^k)$ converges to 0. Since $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a convergent sequence and F is a smooth function, the sequences $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\nabla F(x^k))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ are bounded. Moreover, by (ii),

$$\|\hat{x}^k - x^k\| \leq 2\beta\|\nabla F(x^k)\|. \tag{12}$$

Hence, the sequences $(\nabla F(x)(\hat{x}^k-x^k))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\nabla F(x^k)(\hat{x}^k-x^k))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ are bounded. By Remark 3.1, (9) holds for $x_1 = x$, $x_2 = x^k$, $w_1 = \nabla F(x)(\hat{x}^k-x^k)$ and $w_2 = \nabla F(x^k)(\hat{x}^k-x^k)$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\rho\big(x,\nabla F(x)(\hat{x}^k-x^k)\big)-\rho\big(x^k,\nabla F(x^k)(\hat{x}^k-x^k)\big)\right| &\leq \hat{L}\|x-x^k\| + \|(\nabla F(x)-\nabla F(x^k))(\hat{x}^k-x^k)\|\\ &\leq \hat{L}\|x-x^k\| + \|\nabla F(x)-\nabla F(x^k)\|\|\hat{x}^k-x^k\|,\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{L} := L_G M$ and $\|\nabla F(x)(\hat{x}^k-x^k)\| \leq M$ for all k. Noting that

$$\phi(x,\hat{x}^k-x^k)-\phi(x^k,\hat{x}^k-x^k) = \rho\left(x,\nabla F(x)(\hat{x}^k-x)\right) - \rho\left(x^k,\nabla F(x^k)(\hat{x}^k-x^k)\right),$$

and due to ∇F is locally Lipschitz, from (12) and Remark 3.1, it follows that

$$\left|\phi(x,\hat{x}^k-x^k)-\phi(x^k,\hat{x}^k-x^k)\right| \leq (\hat{L}+L_F\hat{M})\|x-x^k\|, \tag{13}$$

where L_F is the Lipschitz constant of ∇F and $\|\hat{x}^k-x^k\| \leq \hat{M}$ for all k. In particular, $\lim_{k\to\infty}\phi(x,\hat{x}^k-x)-\phi(x^k,\hat{x}^k-x^k) = 0$. Next we consider the function $\theta_\beta(x)$. Note further that

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_\beta(x) \leq& \beta\phi(x,\hat{x}^k-x) + \frac{\|\hat{x}^k-x\|^2}{2}\\ =&\theta_\beta(x^k) + \beta\left[\phi(x,\hat{x}^k-x)-\phi(x^k,\hat{x}^k-x^k)\right] + \frac{\|\hat{x}^k-x\|^2-\|\hat{x}^k-x^k\|^2}{2}\\ =&\theta_\beta(x^k) + \beta\left[\phi(x,\hat{x}^k-x)-\phi(x^k,\hat{x}^k-x^k)\right] + \frac{1}{2}\left[-2\langle\hat{x}^k,x^k-x\rangle + \|x\|^2-\|x^k\|^2\right].\end{aligned}$$

Thus, taking limit in the previous inequality and using that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \phi(x, \hat{x}^k - x) - \phi(x^k, \hat{x}^k - x^k) = 0,$$

and $\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{2}\left[\|x\|^2 - \|x^k\|^2\right] - \langle \hat{x}^k, x^k - x\rangle = 0$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_\beta(x) &\leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} \left\{\theta_\beta(x^k) + \beta\left[\phi(x, \hat{x}^k - x) - \phi(x^k, \hat{x}^k - x^k)\right] - \langle \hat{x}^k, x^k - x\rangle + \frac{\|x\|^2 - \|x^k\|^2}{2}\right\} \\ &= \liminf_{k\to\infty} \theta_\beta(x^k),\end{aligned}$$

establishing the desired result. □

Now we introduce the concept of δ-approximate descent direction.

Definition 3.1 Let $\beta > 0$. Given $\delta \in (0, 1]$, we say that v is a δ-approximate solution of problem (P_x) if $v \in C - x$ and $\beta\phi(x, v) + \frac{\|v\|^2}{2} \leq \delta\theta_\beta(x)$. If $v \neq 0$ we say that v is a δ-approximate descent direction.

Hence, from a numerical point of view, it would be interesting to consider algorithms in which the line-search is given if δ-approximate descent direction instead exact solution of subproblem (P_x).

Remark 3.2 Note that if the solution of (P_x) is 0, then the only possible δ approximate solution is $v = 0$. In other case, due to $\theta_\beta(x) < 0$, there exists feasible directions such that

$$\beta\phi(x, v) + \frac{\|v\|^2}{2} \in [\theta_\beta(x), \delta\theta_\beta(x)].$$

In particular v, the solution of (P_x), is always a δ-approximate solution. □

Next we present the inexact algorithm for solving problem (1).

Inexact **P**rojected **G**radient Method (**IPG Method**). Given $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and $\sigma, \theta \in (0, 1)$.

Initialization: Take $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\beta_0 > 0$.

Iterative step: Given x^k and β_k, compute v^k, δ-approximate solution of (P_{x^k}). If $v^k = 0$, then stop. Otherwise compute

$$j(k) := \min\left\{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \colon F(x^k) - F(x^k + \theta^j v^k) + \sigma\theta^j \nabla F(x^k)v^k \in K(x^k)\right\}. \qquad (14)$$

Set $x^{k+1} = x^k + \gamma_k v^k \in C$, with $\gamma_k = \theta^{j(k)}$.

Next proposition proves that the stepsize γ_k is well defined for all k, *i.e.,* there exists a finite positive integer j that fulfils Armijo-type rule given in (14) at each step of **IPG Method**.

Proposition 3.3 *Subproblem* (14) *has a finite solution, i.e., there exists an index* $j(k) < +\infty$ *which is solution of* (14).

Proof If $v^k = 0$ then (14) holds trivialy. Otherwise, if $v^k \neq 0$ then by Proposition 3.2(i), x^k is not a stationary point and $\theta_\beta(x^k) < 0$. Moreover,

$$\beta_k \phi(x^k, v^k) \leq \beta \phi(x^k, v^k) + \frac{\|v^k\|^T}{2} < \delta \theta_\beta(x^k) < 0.$$

Note further that $\phi(x^k, v^k) = \max_{y \in G(x^k)} y^T \nabla F(x^k) v^k < 0$. Thus, it follows from Proposition 3.1(i) that

$$\nabla F(x^k) v^k \in -int(K(x^k)). \tag{15}$$

Using the Taylor expansion of F at x^k, we obtain that

$$F(x^k) + \sigma \theta^j \nabla F(x^k) v^k - F(x^k + \theta^j v^k) = (\sigma - 1)\theta^j \nabla F(x^k) v^k + o(\theta^j). \tag{16}$$

Since $\sigma < 1$ and $K(x^k)$ is a cone, it follows from (15) that $(\sigma - 1)\theta^j \nabla F(x^k) v^k \in int(K(x^k))$. Then, there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $j \geq \ell$, we get $(\sigma - 1)\theta^j \nabla F(x^k) v^k + o(\theta^j) \in K(x^k)$. Combining the last inclusion with (16), we obtain $F(x^k) + \sigma \theta^j \nabla F(x^k) v^k - F(x^k + \theta^j v^k) \in K(x^k)$ for all $j \geq \ell$. Hence, (14) holds for $j = \ell$, which will be called $j(k)$. □

Remark 3.3 After this Proposition it is clear that given (x^k, v^k), $j(k)$ is well-defined. Furthermore, the sequence generated by **IPG Method** is always feasible. Indeed, as $x^k, x^k + v^k \in C$, $\gamma_k \in (0, 1]$ and C is convex, $x^{k+1} = x^k + \gamma_k v^k \in C$. □

4 Convergence Analysis of IPG Method

In this section we prove the convergence of **IPG Method** presented in the previous section. First we consider the general case and then the result is refined for K–convex functions. From now on, $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the sequence generated by **IPG Method**. We begin the section with the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1 *Assume that*

(a) $\cup_{x \in C} K(x) \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, *where* $\mathcal{K}$ *is a closed, pointed and convex cone.*

(b) *The application* $G(x)$ *is closed.*

(c) $d_H(G(x), G(\bar{x})) \leq L_G\|x - \bar{x}\|$, *for all* $x, \bar{x} \in C$.

If x^* *is an accumulation point of* $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, *then* $\lim_{k\to\infty} F(x^k) = F(x^*)$.

Proof Let x^* be any accumulation point of the sequence $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and denote $(x^{i_k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ a subsequence of $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} x^{i_k} = x^*$. It follows from the definition of Armijo-type line-search in (14) that

$$F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^k) - \sigma\gamma_k \nabla F(x^k)v^k \in -K(x^k). \tag{17}$$

Since **IPG Method** does not stop after finitely many steps, $v_k \neq 0$, which means that $\phi(x, v) < 0$. By Proposition 3.1(i), this means that $\nabla F(x^k)v^k \in -int(K(x^k))$. Multiplying the last inclusion by $\sigma\gamma_k > 0$ and summing with (17), we get from the convexity of $K(x^k)$ that

$$F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^k) - \sigma\gamma_k \nabla F(x^k)v^k + \sigma\gamma_k \nabla F(x^k)v^k \in -int(K(x^k)).$$

Thus, $F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^k) \in -int(K(x^k))$. Since $\cup_{x\in C} K(x) \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, it holds that $int(K(x)) \subseteq int(\mathcal{K})$ for all x, and $F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^k) \in -int(\mathcal{K})$. Then, the sequence $(F(x^k))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is decreasing with respect to cone $\mathcal{K}$. It follows from the continuity of F that $\lim_{k\to\infty} F(x^{i_k}) = F(x^*)$. In particular $F(x^*)$ is an accumulation point, so due to $\mathcal{K}$ is a closed, pointed and convex cone; see, for instance, [28, 29], we get that $\lim_{k\to\infty} F(x^k) = F(x^*)$, as desired. □

Next we present an analogous result as was proved in Proposition 3.2(ii) where v^k is a δ-solution of subproblem (P_{x^k}), which gives us a upper bound for the norm of v^k.

Lemma 4.2 *Let* $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *and* $(\beta_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be sequences generated by* **IPG Method** *and* $\delta \in (0, 1]$. *If* v^k *is a* δ*-approximate direction, then* $\|v^k\| \leq 2\beta_k\|\nabla F(x^k)\|$.

Proof By the definition of δ-approximate direction $\beta_k\phi(x^k, v^k) + \dfrac{\|v^k\|^2}{2} \leq \delta\theta_{\beta_k}(x^k)$. As was shown in Proposition 3.1, $\delta\theta_{\beta_k}(x^k) \leq 0$, because $x^k \in C$. Thus, $\dfrac{\|v^k\|^2}{2} \leq -\beta_k\phi(x^k, v^k)$ and the result follows as in Proposition 3.2(ii). □

Next we prove the stationarity of the accumulation points of the generate sequence. The arguments used in the proof of this theorem are similar to ones used in Theorem 5.1 of [22].

Theorem 4.1 *Suppose that*

(a) $\cup_{x\in C} K(x) \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, *where* $\mathcal{K}$ *is a a closed, pointed and convex cone.*

(b) *The application* $G(x)$ *is closed.*

(c) $d_H(G(x), G(\hat{x})) \leq L_G\|x - \hat{x}\|$, *for all* $x, \hat{x} \in C$.

(d) *$\nabla F(x)$ is a locally Lipschitz function and C is convex.*

If $(\beta_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded sequence, then all accumulation points of $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ are stationary points of problem (1).

Proof Let x^* be an accumulation point of the sequence $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$. Denote $(x^{i_k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ any convergent subsequence to x^*. Since $F \in \mathcal{C}^1$, Lemma 4.2 implies that the subsequence $(v^{i_k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is also bounded and hence has a convergent subsequence. Without loss of generality we assume that $(v^{i_k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to v^* and γ_{i_k} converges to γ^*. Recalling that $\rho(x,w) = \max_{y\in G(x)} y^T w$.

By definition we have $F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^k) - \sigma\gamma_k \nabla F(x^k)v^k \in -\mathcal{K}$. Using Proposition 3.1(i), implies that $\rho\left(x^{i_k}, F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^k) - \sigma\gamma_k \nabla(F(x^k)v^k)\right) \leq 0$. Since the function ρ is sub-linear, as shown in Proposition 3.1 (iv), we get

$$\rho\left(x^k, F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^k)\right) \leq \sigma\gamma_k \rho\left(x^k, \nabla F(x^k)v^k\right). \tag{18}$$

Rewrite (18) as $\rho\left(x^k, F(x^k)\right) - \rho\left(x^k, F(x^{k+1})\right) \geq -\sigma\gamma_k \rho\left(x^k, \nabla F(x^k)v(x^k)\right) \geq 0$, and consider the subsequences $\{x^{i_k}\}$ and $\{v^{i_k}\}$, where $v^{i_k} = v(x^{i_k})$. Then,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \rho\left(x^{i_k}, F(x^{i_k})\right) - \rho\left(x^{i_k}, F(x^{i_k+1})\right) \geq -\sigma \lim_{k\to\infty} \gamma_{i_k} \rho\left(x^{i_k}, \nabla F(x^{i_k})v^{i_k}\right) \geq 0.$$

As already was observed in Remark 3.1, ρ is continuous and moreover from Lemma 4.1, we have $\lim_{k\to\infty} F(x^k) = F(x^*)$. Thus,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \rho\left(x^{i_k}, F(x^{i_k})\right) - \rho\left(x^{i_k}, F(x^{i_k+1})\right) = \rho\left(x^*, F(x^*)\right) - \rho\left(x^*, F(x^*)\right) = 0.$$

These facts imply that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \gamma_{i_k} \rho\left(x^{i_k}, \nabla F(x^{i_k})v^{i_k}\right) = 0$. Hence we can split our analysis in two cases $\gamma^* > 0$ and $\gamma^* = 0$.

Case 1: $\gamma^* > 0$. Here

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \phi(x^{i_k}, v^{i_k}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \rho\left(x^{i_k}, \nabla F(x^{i_k})v(x^{i_k})\right) = 0. \tag{19}$$

Suppose that

$$\theta_{\beta_k}(x^*) = \|v(x^*)\|^2/2 + \beta_k \phi(x^*, v(x^*)) < -\epsilon < 0, \tag{20}$$

where $v(x^*) = \hat{x} - x^*$. Due to the continuity of $\phi(\cdot,\cdot)$ in both arguments, Remark 3.1 and (19) imply that

$$\phi(x^{i_k}, v^{i_k}) > -\frac{\delta\epsilon}{\sup_k \beta_k}$$

for k large enough. After note that $(\beta_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a positive and bounded sequence, then

$$\|v^{i_k}\|^2/2 + \beta_{i_k}\phi(x^{i_k}, v^{i_k}) \geq \beta_{i_k}\phi(x^{i_k}, v^{i_k}) > -\beta_{i_k}\frac{\delta\epsilon}{\sup_k \beta_k} \geq -\delta\epsilon. \tag{21}$$

By definition of the subsequence $(v^{i_k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, we have, for all $v \in C - x^{i_k}$,

$$\delta\left(\frac{\|v\|^2}{2} + \beta_{i_k}\phi(x^{i_k}, v)\right) \geq \delta\theta_{\beta_{i_k}}(x^{i_k}) \geq \frac{\|v^{i_k}\|^2}{2} + \beta_{i_k}\phi(x^{i_k}, v^{i_k}). \tag{22}$$

Combining (21) and (22), we obtain that $\delta\left(\frac{\|v\|^2}{2} + \beta_{i_k}\phi(x^{i_k}, v)\right) > -\delta\epsilon$. In particular consider $\hat{v}^k = \hat{x} - x^{i_k}$. Dividing by $\delta > 0$, we obtain

$$\frac{\|\hat{v}^k\|^2}{2} + \beta_{i_k}\phi(x^{i_k}, \hat{v}^k) > -\epsilon.$$

By the continuity of function ϕ with respect to the first argument and taking limit in the previous inequality, lead us to the following inequality $\|v\|^2/2 + \beta^*\phi(x, v(x^*)) \geq -\epsilon$. This fact and (20) imply

$$-\epsilon > \frac{\|v(x^*)\|^2}{2} + \beta_*\phi(x, v(x^*)) \geq -\epsilon,$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, we can conclude that $\theta_{\beta_*}(x^*) \geq 0$ and, hence, using Proposition 3.2, x^* is a stationary point if $\limsup_{k\to\infty}\gamma_{i_k} > 0$.

Case 2: $\gamma^* = 0$. We consider the previously defined convergent subsequences $(x^{i_k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, $(\beta_{i_k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, $(v^{i_k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, $(\gamma_{i_k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ convergent to x^*, β_*, v^* and $\gamma^* = 0$ respectively. Since $\beta > 0$, we get that

$$\rho\left(x^{i_k}, \nabla F(x^{i_k})v^{i_k}\right) \leq \rho\left(x^{i_k}, \nabla F(x^{i_k})v^{i_k}\right) + \frac{\|v\|^2}{2\beta}.$$

Since v^{i_k} is a δ-approximate solution of (P_x), see Definition 3.1, then

$$\rho\left(x^{i_k}, \nabla F(x^{i_k})v^{i_k}\right) + \frac{\|v\|^2}{2\beta} \leq \frac{\delta}{\beta}\theta_\beta(x^{i_k}) < 0.$$

It follows from taking limit above that $\rho(x^*, \nabla F(x^*)v^*) \leq \frac{\delta}{\beta}\theta_\beta(x^*) \leq 0$. Fix $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for k large enough $F(x^{i_k} + \theta^q v^{i_k}) \notin F(x^{i_k}) + \sigma\theta^q\nabla F(x^{i_k}) - K(x^{i_k})$, as there exists $\hat{y}_{i_k} \in G(x^{i_k})$ such that $\left\langle F(x^{i_k} + \theta^q v^{i_k}) - F(x^{i_k}) - \sigma\theta^q\nabla F(x^{i_k}), \hat{y}_{i_k}\right\rangle > 0$, it holds that

$$\rho\left(x^{i_k}, F(x^{i_k} + \theta^q v^{i_k}) - F(x^{i_k}) - \sigma\theta^q\nabla F(x^{i_k})\right) \geq 0.$$

Taking limit as k tends to ∞, and using that ρ is a continuous function, then

$$\rho\left(x^*, F(x^* + \theta^q v^*) - F(x^*) - \sigma\theta^q\nabla F(x^{i_k})\right) \geq 0.$$

But ρ is a positive homogeneous function, so,

$$\rho\left(x^*, \frac{F(x^* + \theta^q v^*) - F(x^*)}{\theta^q} - \sigma\nabla F(x^*)v^*\right) \geq 0.$$

Taking limit as q tends to ∞, we obtain $\rho\left(x^*,(1-\sigma)\nabla F(x^*)v^*\right) \geq 0$. Finally, since $\rho\left(x^*,\nabla F(x^*)v^*\right) \leq 0$, it holds $\rho\left(x^*,\nabla F(x^*)v^*\right) = 0$. and by Proposition 3.1(ii), this is equivalent to say that $x^* \in S^s$. $\square$

The above result generalizes Theorem 5.1 of [22], where the exact steepest descent method for unconstrained problems was studied. Recall that at the exact variant of the algorithm the direction v^k is computed as an exact solution of problem (P_{x^k}). In order to fill the gap between these two cases, we present two direct consequences of the above result, the inexact method for unconstrained problems and the exact method for the constrained problem.

Corollary 4.1 *Suppose that conditions (a)-(d) of Theorem 4.1 are fulfilled. Then all accumulation points of the sequence $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ generated by the exact variant of* **IPG Method** *are stationary points of problem* (1).

Proof Apply Theorem 4.1 to the case $\delta = 1$. $\square$

Corollary 4.2 *Consider the problem $K - \min F(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where the point to set application K defines the partial order on $\mathbb{R}^m$ and $\nabla F(x)$ is a locally Lipschitz function. Suppose that conditions (a)-(c) of Theorem 4.1 are fulfilled for $C = \mathbb{R}^n$. If β_k is bounded, then all accumulation points of $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ computed by* **IPG Method** *are stationary points of problem* (1).

Proof Directly after Theorem 4.1 for $C = \mathbb{R}^n$. $\square$

The result presented in Theorem 4.1 assumes the existence of accumulation points. We want to emphasize that this is a fact that takes place even when the projected gradient method is applied to the solution of classical scalar problems, i.e., $m = 1$ and $K(x) = \mathbb{R}_+$. The convergence of the whole sequence generated by the algorithm is only possible under stronger assumptions as convexity. Now, based on quasi-Féjer theory, we will prove the full convergence of the sequence generated by **IPG Method** when we assume that F is K–convex. We start by presenting its definition and its properties.

Definition 4.1 Let S be a nonempty subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. A sequence $(z^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is said to be quasi-Fejér convergent to S iff for all $x \in S$, there exists $\bar{k}$ and a summable sequence $(\delta_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\|z^{k+1} - x\|^2 \leq \|z^k - x\|^2 + \delta_k$ for all $k \geq \bar{k}$.

This definition originates in [30] and has been further elaborated in [31]. A useful result on quasi-Fejér sequences is the following.

Fact 4.1 *If $(z^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is quasi-Fejér convergent to S then,*

(i) *The sequence $(z^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded.*

(ii) *If an accumulation point of* $(z^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *belongs to* S*, then the whole sequence* $(z^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *converges.*

Proof See Lemma 6 of [30] and Theorem 1 of [32]. □

For guaranteeing convergence in **IPG Method** we introduce the following definition

Definition 4.2 Let $x \in C$. A direction $v \in C - x$ is scalarization compatible (or simply s-compatible) at x if there exists $w \in conv(G)$ such that $v = P_{C-x}(-\beta\nabla F(x)w)$.

Now we proceed as in Proposition 4.3 of [33]. In the following we present the relation between inexact and s-compatible directions.

Proposition 4.1 *Let* $x \in C$*,* $w \in conv(G)$*,* $v = P_{C-x}(-\beta\nabla F(x)w)$ *and* $\sigma \in [0, 1)$*. If*

$$\beta\phi(\nabla F(x)v) \leq (1-\sigma)\beta\langle w, \nabla F(x)v\rangle - \frac{\sigma}{2}\|v\|^2,$$

then v *is a* σ*-approximate projected gradient direction.*

Proof See Proposition 4.3 of [33]. □

We start the analysis with a technical result.

Lemma 4.3 *Suppose that* F *is* K*–convex. Let* $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be a sequence generated by* **IPG Method** *where* v^k *is an s-compatible direction at* x^k*, given by* $v^k = P_{C-x^k}(-\beta\nabla F(x)w)$*, with* $w^k \in conv(G(x^k))$ *for all* k*. If for a given* $\hat{x} \in C$ *we have* $F(\hat{x}) - F(x^k) \in -K(x^k)$*, then*

$$\|x_{k+1} - \hat{x}\|^2 \leq \|x^k - \hat{x}\|^2 + 2\beta_k\gamma_k|\langle w^k, J\nabla F(x^k)v^k\rangle|.$$

Proof Since $x^{k+1} = x^k + \gamma_k v^k$, we have $\|x_{k+1} - \hat{x}\|^2 = \|x^k - \hat{x}\|^2 + \gamma_k^2\|v^k\|^2 - 2\gamma_k\langle v^k, \hat{x} - x^k\rangle$. Let us analyze the rightmost term of the above expression. It follows from the definition of v^k and the obtuse angle property of projections that $-\langle\beta_k\nabla F(x^k)w^k - v^k, v - v^k\rangle \leq 0$, for all $v \in C - x^k$. Taking $v = \hat{x} - x^k \in C - x^k$ on the above inequality, we obtain

$$\langle v^k, \hat{x} - x^k\rangle \leq \beta\langle w^k, \nabla F(x^k)(\hat{x} - x^k)\rangle - \beta\langle w^k, \nabla F(x^k)v^k\rangle - \|v^k\|^2.$$

Now, from the convexity of F, $\langle w^k, \nabla F(x^k)(\hat{x} - x^k)\rangle \leq \langle w^k, F(\hat{x}) - F(x^k)\rangle \leq 0$, and also the last inequality follows because $F(\hat{x}) \preceq F(x^k)$ and $w^k \in K^*(x^k)$. Moreover, since $\nabla F(x^k)v^k \in int(-K(F(x^k)))$, then we have $\langle w^k, \nabla F(x^k)v^k\rangle < 0$. Thus, we get

$$-\langle v^k, \hat{x} - x^k\rangle \leq \beta_k|\langle w^k, \nabla F(x^k)v^k\rangle - \|v^k\|^2.$$

Since $\gamma_k \in (0, 1]$, the result follows. □

We still need to make a couple of supplementary assumptions, which are standard in convergence analysis of classical (scalar-valued) methods extensions to the vector optimization setting.

Assumption 4.4: Let $(z^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \in F(C)$ be a sequence such that $z^k - z^{k+1} \in K(z^k)$ for all k and $z \in C$, $z^k - z \in \mathcal{K}$ for some closed, convex and pointed cone $\mathcal{K}$, $\cup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} K(z^k) \subset \mathcal{K}$. Then there exists $\hat{z} \in C$ such that $F(\hat{z}) \preceq z^k$ for all k.

Assumption 4.5: The search direction v^k is s-compatible at x^k, that is to say, $v^k = P_{C-x^k}(-\beta\nabla F(x^k)^T w^k)$, where $w^k \in conv(G)$ for all k.

Theorem 4.2 *Assume that F is K–convex and that Assumptions 5.4 and 5.5 hold. If $int(\cap_{k\in\mathbb{N}} K(x^k)) \neq \varnothing$ and there exists $\mathcal{K}$, a pointed, closed and convex cone such that $K(x^k) \subset \mathcal{K}$ then, every sequence generated by the inexact projected gradient method* (**IPG Method**) *is bounded and its accumulation points are weakly efficient solutions.*

Proof Let us consider the set $T := \{x \in C : F(x^k) - F(x) \in K(x^k), \text{ for all } k\}$, and take $\hat{x} \in T$, which exists by Assumption 5.4. Since F is a K–convex function and Assumption 5.5 holds, it follows from Lemma 4.3 that

$$\|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}\|^2 \leq \|x^k - \hat{x}\|^2 + 2\beta_k\gamma_k|\langle w^k, \nabla F(x^k)v^k\rangle|, \tag{23}$$

for all k. By the definition of v^k, it is a descent condition. This means that $-\nabla F(x^k)v^k \in K(x^k)$. Hence $\langle w^k, \nabla F(x^k)v^k\rangle \leq 0$. Then,

$$\|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}\|^2 - \|x^k - \hat{x}\|^2 \leq 2\beta_k\gamma_k|\langle w^k, \nabla F(x^k)v^k\rangle| \leq -2\beta_k\gamma_k\langle w^k, \nabla F(x^k)v^k\rangle. \tag{24}$$

On the other hand as $\mathcal{K}$ is a closed, convex and pointed cone with nonempty interior, $\mathcal{K}^*$ is also a closed, convex and pointed cone with nonempty interior. Since $K(x^k) \subset \mathcal{K}$, it holds that $\mathcal{K}^* \subset K^*(x^k)$. Hence $\mathcal{K}^* \subset \cap_{k\in\mathbb{N}} K^*(x^k)$. Let $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_m \in \mathcal{K}^*$ be a base of $\mathbb{R}^m$. Then, there exits $\alpha_1^k, \ldots, \alpha_m^k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $w^k = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^k\omega_i$. Substituting in (24)

$$\|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}\|^2 - \|x^k - \hat{x}\|^2 \leq -2\beta_k\gamma_k \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^k\langle\omega_i, \nabla F(x^k)v^k\rangle. \tag{25}$$

On the other hand, since $-\nabla F(x^k)v^k \in K(x^k)$, $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_m \in \mathcal{K}^* \subset K^*(x^k)$ and $\beta, \gamma_k \geq 0$, it holds $\langle\omega_i, -2\beta_k\gamma_k\nabla F(x^k)v^k\rangle \geq 0$. Since $\|w^k\| = 1$, α_i^k is uniformly bounded, i.e. there exits $M > 0$, such that for all k, i $|\alpha_i^k| \leq M$. Hence,

$$\|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}\|^2 - \|x^k - \hat{x}\|^2 \leq -2M\beta_k\gamma_k \sum_{i=1}^m \langle\omega_i, \nabla F(x^k)v^k\rangle. \tag{26}$$

By the Armijo-type line-search in (14), $F(x^{k+1}) - F(x^k) - \gamma_k \delta \nabla F(x^k) v^k \in -K(x^k)$. Recalling that $w_i \in \cap_{k\in\mathbb{N}} K^*(x^k)$, we obtain $\dfrac{\langle \omega_i, F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1})\rangle}{\delta} \geq \langle \omega_i, -\gamma_k \nabla F(x^k) v^k \rangle$. It follows from (26) that

$$\|x^{k+1} - \hat{x}\|^2 - \|x^k - \hat{x}\|^2 \leq 2\frac{M}{\delta}\beta_k \sum_{i=1}^{m} \langle \omega_i, F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1})\rangle. \tag{27}$$

For the Fejér convergence of $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ to T, it is enough to prove that the term

$$\beta_k \sum_{i=1}^{m} \langle \omega_i, F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1})\rangle$$

is summable at all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1}) \in K(x^k)$ and $\beta_k \leq 1$ for all k,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} \beta_k \sum_{i=1}^{m} \langle \omega_i, F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1})\rangle \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} \langle \omega_i, F(x^0) - F(x^{n+1})\rangle. \tag{28}$$

As consequence of the Armijo-type line-search, we have $F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1}) \in K(x^k) \subset \mathcal{K}$. So, $(F(x^k))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence with respect to $\mathcal{K}$. Furthermore it is bounded below, also with respect to the order given by $\mathcal{K}$, by $F(\hat{x})$, where $\hat{x} \in T$. Hence, the sequence $(F(x^k))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges and using (28) in the inequality below, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_k \sum_{i=1}^{m} \langle \omega_i, F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1})\rangle &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \beta_k \sum_{i=1}^{m} \langle \omega_i, F(x^k) - F(x^{k+1})\rangle \\
&\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \langle \omega_i, F(x^0) - F(x^{n+1})\rangle \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \langle \omega_i, F(x^0) - \lim_{n} F(x^{n+1})\rangle \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \langle \omega_i, F(x^0) - F(\hat{x})\rangle < +\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

So, the quasi-Fejér monotonicity is fulfilled.

Since $\hat{x}$ is an arbitrary element of T, it is clear that $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges quasi-Fejér to T. Hence, by Fact 4.1, it follows that $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. Therefore, $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ has at least one accumulation point, which, by Theorem 4.1 is stationary. By Proposition 2.2, this point is also weakly efficient, because F is K–convex. Moreover, since C is closed and the whole sequence is feasible, then this accumulation point belongs to C. □

5 Another Variable Order

As already pointed out the variable order structure can be also defined by a cone valued mapping $\bar{K} : \mathbb{R}^m \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$ where $\bar{K}(y)$ is a convex, closed and pointed cone for all $y \in D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. It is worth noting that the domain of the new mapping $\bar{K}$ is $\mathbb{R}^m$ and the orderings considered in the previous sections, are defined by applications whose domain is $\mathbb{R}^n$. As already discussed in [23], convexity can be defined and convex functions satisfy good properties such as the existence of the sub-differential.

In the case of the optimization problem

$$\bar{K} - \min F(x) \text{ s.t. } x \in C, \tag{29}$$

a point $x^* \in C$ solves (29) if for all $x \in C$

$$F(x) - F(x^*) \notin \bar{K}(F(x^*)) \setminus \{0\}.$$

Here we can assume that $\bar{K} : F(C) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$. We shall mention that the main difference between the above problem and (1) yields in the definition of the variable order given now by $\bar{K}$. For a more detailed study of the properties of the minimal points and their characterizations and convexity concept on this case; see [1, 23].

In this framework the definitions of weak solution and stationary point are analogous. The only difference is that instead of $K(x^*)$, the cone $\bar{K}(F(x^*))$ is considered to define the variable partial order. That is, the point x^* is stationary, iff for all $d \in C - x^*$, we have $\nabla F(x^*)d \notin -int(\bar{K}(F(x^*)))$. Then, similarly as in the case of problem (1), the following holds

Proposition 5.1 *If F is a continuously differentiable function and C is a convex set, weak solutions of* (29) *are stationary points. Moreover if F is also convex with respect to $\bar{K}$, the converse is true.*

Proof It follows the same lines of the proof of Propositions 2.1 and 2.2: the Taylor expansion of F and the closeness of $\bar{K}(F(x^*))$ implies the result. □

The Inexact Algorithm is adapted in the following way

F-Inexact **P**rojected **G**radient Method (**FIPG Method**). Given $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and $\sigma, \theta \in (0, 1)$.

Initialization: Take $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\beta_0 > 0$.

Iterative step: Given x^k and β_k, compute v^k, δ-approximate solution of (Q_{x^k}). If $v^k = 0$, then stop. Otherwise compute

$$\ell(k) := \min \left\{ \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \colon f(x^k) + \sigma\theta^\ell \nabla F(x^k)v^k - F(x^k + \theta^\ell v^k) \in K(F(x^k)) \right\}. \tag{30}$$

Set $x^{k+1} = x^k + \gamma_k v^k \in C$, with $\gamma_k = \theta^{\ell(k)}$.

Here the auxiliary problem (Q_{x^k}) is defined as

$$\min_{v\in C-x^k}\left\{\frac{\|v\|^2}{2}+\beta_k\phi(x^k,v)\right\}, \tag{Q_{x^k}}$$

where $\phi:\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$,

$$\phi(x,v):=\max_{y\in G(F(x))} y^T\nabla F(x)v, \tag{31}$$

for $G:\mathbb{R}^m\rightrightarrows\mathbb{R}^m$ generator of $\bar{K}^*(F(x))$.

With this ordering the function ϕ characterizes the stationarity. Furthermore, subproblem (Q_{x^k}) has a unique solution which is $v^k=0$ if and only if x^k is a stationary point. Results analogous to those proven in Proposition 3.2 are also true. These facts implies that **FIPG Method** is well defined, i.e., if it stops, then the computed point is a stationary point and in other case there exists $\ell(k)$ which satisfies the Armijo-type line-search (30). So, only the convergence of a sequence generated by it, must be studied.

As in the last section, we analyze the convergence of the functional values $(F(x^k))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Lemma 5.1 *Suppose that x^* is an accumulation point of $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of the sequence generated by* **FIPG Method**. *If $\cup_{x\in C}\bar{K}(F(x))\subseteq\mathcal{K}$, where $\mathcal{K}$ is a closed, pointed and convex cone, $G(F(x))$ is a closed application such that $d_H(G(F(x)),G(F(\bar{x})))\leq L_{GF}\|x-\bar{x}\|$, for all $x,\bar{x}\in D$, then $\lim_{k\to\infty}F(x^k)=F(x^*)$.*

Proof The result is again proven by the existence of a non-increasing sequence with an accumulation point. □

Next, with the help of the last Lemma, we prove the convergence of the generated sequence with the following result

Theorem 5.1 *Suppose that*

(a) *$\cup_{x\in C}\bar{K}(F(x))\subset\mathcal{K}$, where $\mathcal{K}$ is a a closed, pointed and convex cone.*

(b) *The application $G(F(x))$ is closed.*

(c) *$d_H(G(F(x)),G(F(\hat{x})))\leq L_{GF}\|x-\hat{x}\|$, for all $x,\hat{x}\in C$.*

(d) *$\nabla F(x)$ is a locally Lipschitz function and C is convex.*

If β_k is bounded, then all accumulation points of $(x^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ generated by **FIPG Method** *are stationary points of problem* (29).

Proof It follows from the same lines of the proof of Theorem 4.1. □

Remark 5.1 We want to point out that the result is also true if the condition

$$\mathrm{d}_H(G(F(x)), G(F(\hat{x}))) \leq L_{GF}\|x - \hat{x}\|, \quad \forall x, \hat{x} \in C$$

substitutes $\mathrm{d}_H(G(y), G(\hat{y})) \leq L_G\|y - \hat{y}\|$, for all $y, \hat{y} \in C$. Since F is a continuous differentiable function, it is locally Lipschitz. Thus, the condition is also true.

Theorem 5.2 *Assume that F is $\bar{K}$–convex and additionally:*

(a) *If $(z^k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset F(C)$ is a sequence such that $z^k - z^{k+1} \in \bar{K}(F(z^k))$ for all k and $z \in C$, $z^k - z \in \mathcal{K}$ for some closed, convex and pointed cone $\mathcal{K}$, $\cup_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\bar{K}(F(z^k)) \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, then there exists $\hat{z} \in C$ such that $F(\hat{z}) \preceq z^k$ for all k.*

(b) *The search direction v^k is s-compatible at x^k, i.e., $v^k = P_{C-x^k}(-\beta\nabla F(x^k)^T w^k)$, where $w^k \in conv(G)$, for all k.*

(c) *$int(\cap_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\bar{K}(F(x^k))) \neq \varnothing$.*

(d) *There exists $\mathcal{K}$, a pointed, closed and convex cone such that $\bar{K}(F(x^k))) \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ for all k.*

Then every sequence generated **FIPG Method** *is bounded and its accumulation points are weakly efficient solutions.*

Proof It follows from the same lines of the proof of Theorem 4.2 using now the new variable order structure. □

6 Illustrative Examples

In this section we present some examples of problems (1) and (29), illustrating how both proposed methods are working for each instance. We verify our assumptions in each problem and make some comparisons between the proposed methods.

The algorithm was implemented in MatLab R2012 and ran at a Intel(R) Atom(TM) CPU N270 at 1.6GHz. Starting points are not solutions and randomly generated. Although to compute the dual positive cone given the original one may be not an easy task in general, the computation of approximate directions is more complicated. Indeed, after the definition, the optimal value of problem (P_x) must be known. The use of s-compatible directions at the iteration k of the proposed method, see Definition 4.2, is recommended in the case in which the projection onto the set $C - x^k$ is not too complicated. This is the case of the set of feasible solutions of the next example. Clearly in all examples below the cones defined the variable order structure are closed applications and Lipschitz with respect to the Hausdorff distance. We worked with the stopping criterion as $\|v^k\| < 10^{-4}$ and the solutions when the methods stop were displayed with four digits. We also recorded CPU Time in seconds and Number of Iterations in each case.

Example 6.1 We consider the vector problem as (1) with

$$K-\min\ F(x)=\left(x+1,x^2+1\right),\ \text{s.t.}\ \ x\in[0,1],$$

where $F:\mathbb{R}\rightrightarrows\mathbb{R}^2$ and the variable order is given by $K:\mathbb{R}\rightrightarrows\mathbb{R}^2$,

$$K(x):=\left\{(z_1,z_2)\in\mathbb{R}^2:z_1\geq 0,\ (x^2+1)z_1-(x+1)z_2\leq 0\right\}.$$

In this model the closed interval $[0,\sqrt{2}-1]\approx[0,\ 0.4142]$ is the set of minimizers.

IPG Method was ran ten times random Initial Points and ended at the Solution points, which are obtained after the verification of the stopping criterion. The method gives the following data:

Iterations	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**
Initial Point	0.6557	0.6948	0.8491	0.9340	0.6787	0.7577	0.7431	0.4387	0.6555	0.9502
Solution	0.4115	0.4128	0.4140	0.4135	0.4116	0.4131	0.4127	0.4136	0.4114	0.4130
CPU Time	0.0001	0.0250	0.0001	0.0156	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.1094	0.0156	0.0781
Nº. Iterations	16	19	23	26	17	20	20	4	16	28

Note that in all cases optimal solutions were computed and that the solution point are in the set of optimal solutions. □

The last example is a non-convex problem corresponding to the model studied in the previous section.

Example 6.2 [cf. Example 4.13 of [8]] Consider the vector problem as (29) with

$$\bar{K}-\min\ F(x_1,x_2)=\left(x_1^2,x_2^2\right),\ \text{s.t.}\ \pi\leq x_1^2+x_2^2\leq 2\pi,$$

where $F:\mathbb{R}^2\rightrightarrows\mathbb{R}^2$ and the variable order is leading by $\bar{K}:\mathbb{R}^2\rightrightarrows\mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\bar{K}(y)=\left\{z=(z_1,z_2)\in\mathbb{R}^2:\|z\|_2\leq\left[\begin{pmatrix}2&1\\-1&-1\end{pmatrix}y\right]^T\cdot z/\pi\right\}.$$

The set of solutions (stationary points) of this problem is

$$\left\{(x_1,x_2)\in\mathbb{R}^2:x_1^2+x_2^2=\pi\quad\text{or}\quad x_1^2+x_2^2=2\pi\right\}.$$

F-IPG Method computes the following points:

Iterations	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**
Initial Point	1.9069	3.6001	2.8460	1.7527	−1.0473	2.5081	2.0901	4.2744	2.9664	−0.1562
	−1.3314	1.9063	3.7869	5.3797	−1.7000	2.9696	4.3870	1.8996	3.2282	2.0467
Solution	2.1081	−1.3562	1.1453	1.6623	0.3327	1.1398	1.5430	−1.9492	1.0741	−0.0410
	−2.4332	5.1972	6.1779	6.0593	−2.4844	6.1789	6.0908	2.4638	6.1907	−2.5063
CPU Time	0.12501	0.1001	0.0156	0.0156	0.1094	0.0156	0.0001	0.0001	0.0156	0.1719
Nº. Iterations	3	5	3	2	2	4	2	2	3	4

Note that the solutions computed at all iterations of the proposed method belong to the set of optimal solutions. □

7 Final Remarks

The projected gradient method is one of the classical and basic schemes for solving constrained optimization problems. We have adapted this scheme doing inexact gradient steps for solving smooth constrained vector optimization problem under a variable ordering. In particular, the full convergence of the generated sequence to a weakly efficient point is still an open problem in variable ordered setting. Future work will be addressed to investigate particular instances in which the objective function is a non-smooth function. The inexact projected methods proposed in this work promote future research on other efficient variants for this kind of problems. The numerical behavior of these approaches under K-convexity of the objective function remains open. Despite its computational shortcomings, it hopefully sets the foundations of future more efficient and general algorithms for this setting.

Acknowledgements: The results of this paper were developed during the stay of the second author at the University of Halle-Wittenberg supported by the Humboldt Foundation.

References

1. Eichfelder, G.: Variable Ordering Structures in Vector Optimization. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2014)
2. Baatar, D., Wiecek, M.M.: Advancing equitability in multiobjective programming. Comput. Math. Appl. **2**, 225–234 (2006)
3. Engau, A.: Variable preference modeling with ideal-symmetric convex cones, J. Global Optim. **42**, 295–311 (2008)
4. Wiecek, M.M.: Advances in cone-based preference modeling for decision making with multiple criteria. Decis. Mak. Manuf. Serv. **1**, 153–173 (2007)
5. Bao, T.Q., Mordukhovich, B.S., Soubeyran, A.: Variational analysis in psychological modeling. J. Optim. Theory Appl. **164**, 290–315 (2015)
6. Bao, T.Q., Mordukhovich, B.S., Soubeyran, A.: Fixed Points and Variational Principles with Applications to Capability Theory of Wellbeing via Variational Rationality. Set-Valued Var. Anal. **23**, 375–398 (2015)
7. Eichfelder, G.: Vector Optimization in Medical Engineering, Chapter in: Mathematics Without Boundaries, Pardalos, P.M. and Rassias, T.M. (Eds.), Springer, pp. 181–215 (2014)
8. Eichfelder, G., Duc Ha, T. X.: Optimality conditions for vector optimization problems with variable ordering structures. Optimization **62**, 597–627 (2013)

9. Eichfelder, G.: Optimal elements in vector optimization with variable ordering structure. J. Optim. Theory Appl. **151**, 217–240 (2011)

10. Bello Cruz, J.Y.: A subgradient method for vector optimization problems. SIAM J. Optim. **23**, 2169–2182 (2013)

11. Bello Cruz, J.Y., Lucambio Pérez, L.R: A subgradient-like algorithm for solving vector convex inequalities. J. Optim. Theory Appl. **162**, 392–404 (2014)

12. Bonnel, H., Iusem, A.N., Svaiter, B.F.: Proximal methods in vector optimization. SIAM J. Optim. **15**, 953–970 (2005)

13. Fliege, J., Graña Drummond, L.M., Svaiter, B.F.: Newton's method for multiobjective optimization. SIAM J. Optim. **20**, 602–626 (2009)

14. Graña Drummond, L.M., Maculan, N., Svaiter, B.F.: On the choice of parameters for the weighting method in vector optimization. Math. Program. **111**, 201–216 (2008)

15. Jahn, J.: Scalarization in vector optimization. Math. Program. **29**, 203–218 (1984)

16. Luc, D.T.: Scalarization of vector optimization problems. J. Optim. Theory Appl. **55**, 85–102 (1987)

17. Bello Cruz, J.Y., Lucambio Pérez, L.R., Melo, J.G.: Convergence of the projected gradient method for quasiconvex multiobjective optimization. Nonlinear Anal. **74**, 5268–5273 (2011)

18. Fukuda, E.H., Graña Drummond, L.M.: On the convergence of the projected gradient method for vector optimization. Optimization **60**, 1009–1021 (2011).

19. Graña Drummond, L.M., Iusem, A.N.: A projected gradient method for vector optimization problems. Comput. Optim. Appl. **28**, 5–30 (2004)

20. Fliege, J., Svaiter, B.F.: Steepest descent methods for multicriteria optimization. Math. Methods Oper. Res. **51**, 479–494 (2000)

21. Graña Drummond, L.M., Svaiter, B.F.: A steepest descent method for vector optimization. J. Comput. Appl. Math. **175**, 395–414 (2005)

22. Bello Cruz, J.Y., Bouza Allende, G.: A steepest descent-like method for variable order vector optimization problems. J. Optim. Theory Appl. **162**, 371–391 (2014)

23. Bello Cruz, J.Y., Bouza Allende, G., Lucambio Pérez, L.R: Subgradient algorithms for solving variable inequalities. Appl. Math. Comput. **247**, 1052–1063 (2014)

24. Luc, D. T.: Pareto Optimality, Game Theory And Equilibria. In Pareto Optimality, Springer Optimization and its Applications **17**, 481–515 (2008)

25. Luc, D.T.: Theory of vector optimization. Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems **319**, Springer, Berlin (1989)

26. Jahn, J.: Vector optimization - Theory, applications and extensions. Springer, Berlin (2004)

27. Jahn, J.: Mathematical vector optimization in Partially Ordered Linear Spaces. Verlag Peter D. Lang, Frankfurt (1986)

28. Isac, G., Tammer, C.: Application of a vector-valued Ekeland-type variational principle for deriving optimality conditions. In: Nonlinear Analysis and Variational Problems: In Honor of George Isac, Springer Optimization and Applications **35** 343–365 (2010)

29. Peressini, A.L.: Ordered Topological Vector Space. Harper and Row, (1967)

30. Browder, F.E.: Convergence theorems for sequences of nonlinear operators in Banach spaces. Math. Z. **100**, 201–225 (1967)

31. Iusem, A.N., Svaiter, B.F., Teboulle, M.: Entropy-like proximal methods in convex programming. Math. Oper. Res. **19**, 790–814 (1994)

32. Burachik, R., Graña Drummond, L.M., Iusem, A.N., Svaiter, B.F.: Full convergence of the steepest descent method with inexact line searches. Optimization **32**, 137–146 (1995)

33. Fukuda, E.H., Graña Drummond, L.M.: Inexact projected gradient method for vector optimization. Comput. Optim. Appl. **54** 473–493 (2013)